

## DAMAGING STORY TOLD BY WITNESS

Mrs. Hall Asked Miss Rosson to  
Tell Grand Jury Nothing  
Incriminating.

## FIRST SENSATION OF TRIAL

Richmond Man Deals Blow to  
Defense With Statement  
About Pistol.

(Special to The Times-Dispatch.)  
Louis, Va., July 30.—Aid of the  
witnesses they believe to be partial to  
the accused woman, attorneys for the  
prosecution in the trial of Mrs. Eliza-  
beth A. Hall, under indictment for the  
murder of her husband, began to-day  
connecting the links in the chain of  
circumstances with which they expect  
to crush Mrs. Hall and establish her  
guilt, and when court adjourned this  
afternoon, shortly before 5 o'clock, they  
had, it was generally admitted, carried  
the fight well into the lines of the  
defense.

It was testified on the stand that  
Mrs. Hall had approached Miss Mamie  
Rosson just before she appeared be-  
fore the grand jury summoned to in-  
vestigate the crime, and that she asked  
Miss Rosson not to tell anything that  
would place the guilt upon her. It  
was testified by Charles Johnston, of  
115 East Clay street, Richmond, a  
young man who had been paying atten-  
tion to Miss Elsie Wood, that on April  
5, nine days before the murder, he ex-  
amined Victor Hall's revolver and  
found that every chamber was loaded.  
Miss Wood had testified previously that  
she fired that pistol about a month  
before Victor Hall was murdered, and  
that she left the empty cartridge under  
the hammer.

## DID NOT BELIEVE THAT

It was testified by Mrs. W. R. Dun-  
kum that Mrs. Hall told her that she  
did not believe that Dunkum killed her  
husband, and that she knew she was  
suspected of slaying her consort, so  
that she could "get" Bill Roberts John-  
son, who said killed his horse and  
rode to Green Spring as soon as he  
heard of the murder, swore that he had  
known Victor Hall all his life, and that  
he was of a peaceful disposition, and  
so far as he knew, had no enemies. He  
said that he noticed no change in Mrs.  
Hall's usual manner when he spoke to  
her after the murder, and that the  
first thing she told him upon his ar-  
rival was that Dunkum's store had  
been burned.

Mrs. Harry W. Porter and Thomas  
M. Thayer, who performed the autopsy  
on Victor Hall, stated that they un-  
derstand that he died from the effects  
of a bullet wound, one comforting ray  
of hope was snatched from their evi-  
dence by the defense. Both physicians  
said that they saw a swollen bruise  
over Victor's left eye, and that it  
could have been inflicted by either a  
blow or a fall. The defense is pre-  
paring to prove that Victor Hall was  
either struck in the face before he  
was shot or that he was shot from be-  
hind as he turned from his assailant  
at the door, and fell face downward  
as he staggered to the door.

J. J. Fulton, of counsel for the  
prosecution, startled court and specta-  
tors when he turned suddenly to W. R.  
Dunkum, under indirect examination,  
and asked him if he had killed  
Victor Hall.

"No," the witness replied with quick-  
ness, and before this line of ques-  
tioning could be advanced it was halted  
by the court.

## ACCUSED WOMAN SHOWS

Through it all, the accused woman  
maintained her composure, not an eye-  
lash quivering to show that there was  
a strain about her heart. Only Mrs. N.  
Hall, mother of the murdered man,  
covered her face. Except in the warm  
greetings of her family, Mrs. Hall has  
been absolutely without apparent emo-  
tion. Frequently now she consults with  
her attorneys and prompts them in  
their cross-examination of the wit-  
nesses, combining her sharp intelli-  
gence and personal knowledge of the  
witnesses with the trained acuteness  
of her lawyers. She started indignantly  
at the two Dunkums, man and wife,  
but without result, for neither bent  
their eyes upon the woman at the bar.

The case progressed more rapidly  
to-day, though the trial is expected  
of the trial being finished before the  
middle of next week. Eight witnesses  
were examined, but John Johnson, one  
of the eight, will be replaced upon the  
stand to-morrow morning, and the  
attorneys have argued upon the im-  
possibility of evidence concerning the  
incendiary fires at Green Spring sta-  
tion. By means of this evidence the  
prosecution may attempt to establish  
a possible motive for the murder of  
Victor Hall, though establishment of a  
motive is not absolutely required.

## INTEREST IN CASE

Interest in the case remains unabated, and the sessions of the  
court the room was so crowded that  
many had to stand. Noticeable among  
the spectators are many women, some  
of whom are summer visitors in Louisa.  
The trial has been a source of great  
change in the dull routine of the  
one's self through the long and un-  
eventful days. And they make a  
brave showing with their city-made  
dresses as contrasted with the gingham  
and calico of the rural sisters, and a  
pleasing prospect to the city young  
gallants of the countryside.

The jurors are taking their semicon-  
tinental philosophically. They have, as  
it were, graduated seats at the most  
sensational trial in the history of  
Louisa. They get three square meals  
a day and at night they have the un-  
usual pleasure of watching the sum-  
mer visitors in Louisa. The trial has  
been a source of great change in the  
dull routine of the one's self through  
the long and uneventful days. And  
they make a brave showing with their  
city-made dresses as contrasted with  
the gingham and calico of the rural  
sisters, and a pleasing prospect to the  
city young gallants of the countryside.

C. & O. MOUNTAIN SPECIAL.  
To White Sulphur and Intermediate Resorts.  
August 1, 5, 8, 11, 14, 17, 20, 23, 26, 29, 31.  
Inquire of C. & O. ticket agents for details.

## BALTIMORE MAYOR RICHMOND'S GUEST

Two Cities Bury Stragglings  
Memories of Regional Bank  
Unpleasantness.

## VOW NEW FRIENDSHIP BOND

Mayor Ainslie Tenders Brilliant  
Luncheon to Visitors at  
Commonwealth Club.

Richmond and Baltimore, of late  
coupled vividly in the public prints  
as rivals for regional reserve honors,  
buried the last stragglings memories of  
the recent unpleasantness under forty-  
eight hours of friendship yesterday, and  
through the persons of Mayor Ainslie  
and Mayor Preston vowed a new bond  
of friendship and took a patriotic oath  
that nothing shall hereafter divide Vir-  
ginia and Maryland but the Potomac.

The occasion for the new declaration  
of fealty was the visit of a distin-  
guished party from the Maryland  
metropolis, headed by Mayor James  
Preston, for the purpose of inviting the  
city of Richmond and the State of  
Virginia to come to Baltimore during  
the week of September 8, when that  
city will celebrate with imposing cer-  
emonial the hundredth anniversary of  
the repulse of the British at Fort Mc-  
Henry, which led directly to the end  
of the War of 1812 and the signing of  
the treaty of Ghent.

Mayor Ainslie, as official host, and  
150 representative citizens gave the  
visitors a warm welcome at the Com-  
monwealth Club, where a luncheon  
was given in the honor of the guests.  
In the afternoon, between 12:30 o'clock  
and the luncheon hour the party, ac-  
companied by the Mayor and a small  
delegation of local men, made a round  
of the points of interest in automobils,  
touring the length of the city from  
Chimborazo Park to the Country Club  
of Virginia.

Following an afternoon at the Com-  
monwealth Club, in which an excellent  
luncheon and a number of happy  
speeches sped the last hours of the  
visit to Richmond, the party boarded a  
Special A. R. Line train at 5:15 o'clock  
for Baltimore, where they were due  
to arrive at 9:30 o'clock last night.

Earlier in the day the visitors paid  
a visit to Governor Stuart at the ex-  
ecutive offices in the Capitol, and re-  
ceived from him his promise to attend  
the centennial celebration accompanied  
by a detachment of the State militia.  
From the Governor's office the visi-  
tors went to the office of Mayor Ainslie  
in the City Hall, where they were  
officially welcomed to the city.

In the spacious clubrooms of the  
Commonwealth, however, was staged  
the part of the welcome which went  
down in the records as the most dem-  
onstrative and inspiring incident of the  
visit. Guests and visitors assembled  
in the big reading-room, and Mayor  
Ainslie made a short address of wel-  
come.

There was a ring of earnestness in  
the mayor's speech, which conveyed to  
the visitors the good will of the city  
by the James and Mayor Preston, in  
acknowledging the welcome which they  
brought with an expression of firm friendship  
on behalf of the city of the Potomac—  
two cities which, he said, are much  
alike in their history and traditions,  
and progress side by side in in-  
dustry and commerce.

There was a ring of earnestness in  
the mayor's speech, which conveyed to  
the visitors the good will of the city  
by the James and Mayor Preston, in  
acknowledging the welcome which they  
brought with an expression of firm friendship  
on behalf of the city of the Potomac—  
two cities which, he said, are much  
alike in their history and traditions,  
and progress side by side in in-  
dustry and commerce.

There was a ring of earnestness in  
the mayor's speech, which conveyed to  
the visitors the good will of the city  
by the James and Mayor Preston, in  
acknowledging the welcome which they  
brought with an expression of firm friendship  
on behalf of the city of the Potomac—  
two cities which, he said, are much  
alike in their history and traditions,  
and progress side by side in in-  
dustry and commerce.

There was a ring of earnestness in  
the mayor's speech, which conveyed to  
the visitors the good will of the city  
by the James and Mayor Preston, in  
acknowledging the welcome which they  
brought with an expression of firm friendship  
on behalf of the city of the Potomac—  
two cities which, he said, are much  
alike in their history and traditions,  
and progress side by side in in-  
dustry and commerce.

(Continued on Third Page.)

# NEXT FEW HOURS WILL DECIDE IF EUROPE IS TO BE INVOLVED IN UNIVERSAL WARFARE



Entrance to the Palace Grounds of Belgrade.

## DISCUSSION OF MERITS NOT NEEDED, SAYS BRYAN

Reopening of Original Controversy  
Over Panama Canal Zone Seizure  
Really Objectionable.

## FRIENDSHIP IS ONLY OBJECT

Secretary Explains That Even if  
United States Exercised Right of  
Eminent Domain, It Is Not Believed  
From Compensating Colombia.

Washington, July 30.—A second  
formal statement in defense of the  
proposed Colombian treaty was issued  
to-day by Secretary Bryan. Without  
mentioning Colonel Roosevelt, Mr.  
Bryan replied to arguments advanced  
by the former President in his address  
upon the administration's proposal to  
pay Colombia \$25,000,000 in settlement  
of claims growing out of the separa-  
tion of Panama and acquisition of the  
Canal Zone by the United States.

Reiterating his declaration that in  
regard to the treaty it is not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged that  
even if the United States in acquiring  
the Canal Zone was exercising a right  
of eminent domain, it was not neces-  
sary to examine into the merits of the  
controversy of the action of the United  
States in 1903, the secretary urged